

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 15, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 15, 2022, at 4:39 p.m.

Appointment:  
United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
Clerk.

### SPEAK OUT ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1464, I call up the bill (S. 4524) to limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1464, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4524

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Speak Out Act”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Sexual harassment and assault remain pervasive in the workplace and throughout civic society, affecting millions of Americans.

(2) Eighty-one percent of women and 43 percent of men have experienced some form of sexual harassment or assault throughout their lifetime.

(3) One in 3 women has faced sexual harassment in the workplace during her career, and an estimated 87 to 94 percent of those who experience sexual harassment never file a formal complaint.

(4) Sexual harassment in the workplace forces many women to leave their occupation or industry, or pass up opportunities for advancement.

(5) In order to combat sexual harassment and assault, it is essential that victims and survivors have the freedom to report and publicly disclose their abuse.

(6) Nondisclosure and nondisparagement provisions in agreements between employers and current, former, and prospective employees, and independent contractors, and between providers of goods and services and consumers, can perpetuate illegal conduct by silencing those who are survivors of illegal sexual harassment and assault or illegal retaliation, or have knowledge of such conduct, while shielding perpetrators and enabling them to continue their abuse.

(7) Prohibiting nondisclosure and nondisparagement clauses will empower survivors to come forward, hold perpetrators accountable for abuse, improve transparency around illegal conduct, enable the pursuit of justice, and make workplaces safer and more productive for everyone.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **NONDISCLOSURE CLAUSE.**—The term “nondisclosure clause” means a provision in a contract or agreement that requires the parties to the contract or agreement not to disclose or discuss conduct, the existence of a settlement involving conduct, or information covered by the terms and conditions of the contract or agreement.

(2) **NONDISPARAGEMENT CLAUSE.**—The term “nondisparagement clause” means a provision in a contract or agreement that requires 1 or more parties to the contract or agreement not to make a negative statement about another party that relates to the contract, agreement, claim, or case.

(3) **SEXUAL ASSAULT DISPUTE.**—The term “sexual assault dispute” means a dispute involving a nonconsensual sexual act or sexual contact, as such terms are defined in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, or similar applicable Tribal or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.

(4) **SEXUAL HARASSMENT DISPUTE.**—The term “sexual harassment dispute” means a dispute relating to conduct that is alleged to constitute sexual harassment under applicable Federal, Tribal, or State law.

#### SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL ENFORCEABILITY OF NONDISCLOSURE AND NONDISPARAGEMENT CONTRACT CLAUSES RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT DISPUTES AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT DISPUTES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to a sexual assault dispute or sexual harassment dispute, no nondisclosure clause or nondisparagement clause agreed to before the dispute arises shall be judicially enforceable in instances in which conduct is alleged to have violated Federal, Tribal, or State law.

(b) **CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF STATE LAW.**—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit a State or locality from enforcing a provision of State law governing nondisclosure or nondisparagement clauses that is at least as protective of the right of an individual to speak freely, as provided by this Act.

(c) **CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND TRIBAL LAW.**—This Act shall not be construed to supersede a provision of Federal, State, or Tribal Law that governs the use of pseudonyms in the filing of claims involving sexual assault or sexual harassment disputes.

(d) **PROTECTION OF TRADE SECRETS AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit an employer and an employee from protecting trade secrets or proprietary information.

#### SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY.

This Act shall apply with respect to a claim that is filed under Federal, State, or Tribal law on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 4524.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, S. 4524, the Speak Out Act, empowers survivors of sexual misconduct by prohibiting the use of nondisclosure and nondisparagement clauses that serve to silence survivors who entered into agreements containing those clauses before a dispute arises.

Often buried in the fine print of contracts of adhesion that workers and consumers sign every day to secure employment, goods, or services, these confidentiality clauses have contributed to the culture of silence in cases involving sexual misconduct. As such, they have routinely enabled sexual predators to evade accountability.

The confidential nature of these clauses makes it extremely difficult to fully diagnose the scope of this problem. Nevertheless, experts estimate that more than one-third of workers in the United States are required to sign a nondisclosure agreement in their employment contracts.

This is particularly concerning because of the rampant nature of sexual abuse in the workplace. An estimated 81 percent of women and 43 percent of men will experience sexual harassment in their lifetimes, and more than half of all women report being subjected to unwanted sexual activity while in the workplace.

But these appalling numbers do not even tell the full story. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission found that the vast majority of survivors simply never report incidents of sexual harassment or sexual assault.

Today, we will take an important step toward fixing this problem by banning the enforcement of nondisclosure and nondisparagement clauses agreed to before a sexual harassment or sexual assault dispute arises. For the purpose of this bill, a dispute arises when a person chooses to exercise their legal rights by asserting a claim of sexual harassment or sexual assault in some official context, such as by complaining to a government agency or by filing a lawsuit.

This legislation continues Congress' important work to protect the rights of survivors to come forward and hold perpetrators accountable for abuse.

Earlier this year, on a bipartisan basis, we enacted H.R. 4445, which empowered survivors to decide whether they resolve their disputes in court or through arbitration. That bill was an example of how Congress can and should function. We worked together, across the aisle, to identify a problem, establish a bipartisan solution to that problem, and pass legislation to restore the rights of millions of Americans to their day in court.

The Speak Out Act is an opportunity for us to work together once again to end the oppressive culture of silence hiding sexual misconduct, promote transparency and accountability, and make the workplace safer for everyone.

This legislation has already passed the Senate unanimously, and it is supported by a broad coalition of public interest organizations, including the American Association for Justice, the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, RALIANCE, The Army of Survivors, the National Domestic Violence Hotline, and the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault.

I thank our colleagues, Representatives FRANKEL, BUCK, CICILLINE, JAYAPAL, GRIFFITH, BUSTOS, and OWENS for their leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, sexual misconduct is terrible and it is wrong. Those who engage in it should be held accountable. But this bill, while well intentioned, is misguided.

For starters, it is a massive Federal overreach. It regulates contract law that has been and should be handled at the State level. Some States have decided to regulate confidentiality clauses in contracts. Others have decided not to. That is how our system of government works. That is how our Constitution works, States experimenting to find out what, in fact, works best.

However, this bill creates a new Federal floor that undercuts the power of States in the process. This is just the beginning of a new push by Democrats to chip away at States' rights.

The White House said as much this week. In commenting on the bill, the Biden administration said it "Looks forward to continuing to work with the Congress to advance broader legislation that addresses a range of issues implicated in NDAs and nondisparagement clauses."

They are not hiding the ball here. Federalism is a serious issue, and Congress should not be taking power from the States just to impose its top-down approach.

Additionally, we should take a hard look at the findings included in the bill as passed by the Senate. House Democrats intentionally left these findings out of the version of the bill that the Committee on the Judiciary marked up. These findings include statistics about the percentage of men and women who have experienced some form of sexual harassment or sexual assault in their lifetime. It is not clear where these statistics and new findings come from, but they seem to rely on a study that uses a broad definition of sexual harassment, very broad, that included instances of "misgendering" as sexual harassment. That definition goes way beyond existing law.

A finding of Congress that effectively treats "misgendering" on its own as a form of sexual harassment will doubtlessly lead to future efforts to expand the law in other ways. If Democrats are going to include findings like this, they

should at least have to debate it in the committee. We should think carefully about these findings before cementing them in Federal law.

Finally, this bill, as drafted, is too broad and will affect contractual matters completely unrelated to sexual misconduct. A confidentiality clause may cover a wide range of information. When the bill applies, it nullifies the entire confidentiality clause, with just a few poorly defined exceptions.

As such, it will give trial lawyers an incentive to add unsupported allegations in litigation so they can void a confidentiality clause and access and use confidential information unrelated to the sexual misconduct.

We all condemn sexual harassment and sexual assault, but this is a flawed bill, and it is going to create problems down the road.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I only wish this bill did what the gentleman from Ohio says it does. By his logic, we should never have passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. We should have left it with the States. That obviously didn't work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very, very proud to rise today in support of this game-changing, historic bill, the Speak Out Act. I thank our Senate and House sponsors, Representatives BUCK and BUSTOS and Senators GILLIBRAND and BLACKBURN.

Thanks also to the Committee on the Judiciary, to our staff, and to Becca Flikier in my office. Most especially, thanks to two very, very courageous women who may be with us today, Gretchen Carlson and Julie Roginsky, who, against all odds, fought back against the abuse of powerful men and a powerful corporation and who have lifted the voices of women by leading efforts to stem the scourge of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace and civic society. Thank you to Gretchen and Julie.

Today, Madam Speaker, we will pass legislation that, in tandem with the no forced arbitration law, is aimed at stopping sexual abuse in the workplace and holding abusers accountable.

With all due respect to my friends on the other side, we are here to protect women from being raped, not States from being raped.

Current Federal law and most States allow employers and others to force nondisclosure agreements into employment and consumer contracts that silence survivors of sexual assault and harassment. These are known as forced NDAs, and one-third of our workforce is subject to them.

Madam Speaker, I have an example of one right here. I mean, for a

layperson to look, I would just tell you, it is a bunch of gobbledygook. Nowhere would you know from reading this NDA, which is very typical, that it means if your boss rapes you, you can't tell a soul about it or you will be penalized.

Businesses are using these NDAs to cover up their dirty little secrets of sexual abuse that force survivors to bear the trauma in silence. It is not bad enough, Madam Speaker, that a survivor is humiliated, emotionally scarred, or physically hurt, that they have to quit their job or turn down a promotion or leave the field entirely. If they are forced to sign an NDA before a dispute arises, they must suffer in silence and not even be able to tell a spouse, a parent, or a coworker. If they do, they can be fired or disciplined or sued for damages and attorney's fees. That is crazy and that is unjust.

Forced NDAs punish the survivor and protect the perpetrator, who is set free to abuse and abuse and abuse again.

Today, we hold abusers accountable and change the culture of the workplace. Employers who were used to sweeping these stories under the rug will now be forced to stop toxic workplaces, sexual harassment, and sexual assault before it happens. This should lead to safer, more productive workplaces and a civic society for all.

The change couldn't come soon enough. It is not just the movie and the TV personalities we have read about that have been the victims of sexual abuse in the workplace. One in three women, disproportionately women of color, have suffered sexual harassment in the workplace. There are 71 million women in the workplace. That is millions and millions of women who have to endure this.

In our bipartisan Women's Caucus, we heard story after story from hotel maids raped by guests, waitresses pinched by their customers to earn tips, farmworkers assaulted in the field by their supervisors, a tech worker forced to date potential customers.

It doesn't matter whether you are a hotel maid, a farmworker, secretary, or CEO. People in all walks of life are being inappropriately touched, raped, and harassed by supervisors, coworkers, customers, and service providers. The Speak Out Act, Madam Speaker, will make these forced NDAs null and void.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

□ 1230

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, it does not prevent a business from protecting its trade secrets, and it does not prevent giving the survivors an option to sign an NDA at a post-claim settlement if they choose.

So, folks, let's all say "no" to the dirty little secrets that promote sexual

abuse, ruin lives, and degrade businesses.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to vote "yes" on the Speak Out Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I want to be the first to admit, this is a difficult bill to debate. It sounds good. I believe the intentions of the other side of the aisle are good as well. Nobody should be subjected to sexual harassment.

But there is a problem. We are legislating outside of our domain. We are violating States' rights in doing this. The law that is being proposed to pass today here has already in some form or another been implemented in 15 different States. But guess what, those 15 different States don't all have the same solution. It is sort of arrogant for us to sit here and say that we are going to come up with a one-size-fits-all that is going to be better than anything those 15 States have done.

I say to my constituents at home, that there are three tests that I apply to any bill before voting for it.

The first test is, is it constitutional. This bill is questionable whether it is constitutional because it would regulate intrastate contracts, not just interstate contracts. We all know we have no business inside of the States.

The other test that I apply is, can we afford it. Well, ostensibly, this bill doesn't cost that much to impose a new thing on employers or on contracts.

But the third test that I always apply is, is this something we should solve at the Federal level or can States do it better? That is where this bill fails. The States can legislate on this. The States have legislated on this; 15 different States since 2018 have legislated on this.

In fact, as I read this bill and as we debated it, I wondered what is the definition of sexual harassment. Well, the bill itself refers to the State definitions of sexual harassment. It is tacitly acknowledging that contract law is the domain of the States. There was a concern expressed during the debate in committee on this that is this the camel putting its nose in the tent when we let Federal laws intervene in or override State laws, and that was a concern that was expressed.

But it wasn't a conspiracy theory that there would be more legislation after that. In fact, the ink is not even dry on this; the vote hasn't happened today. But 2 days ago, just recently, the Executive Office of the President, OMB, issued a Statement of Administration Policy about this bill.

They are giddy at overriding State laws and breaking State contracts. In fact, their statement says: "The administration looks forward to continuing to work with the Congress to advance broader legislation that ad-

resses the range of issues implicated in NDAs and nondisparagement clauses." They can't wait to do more of this. They can't wait to take over the State legislatures' roles in legislating these issues.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" against this. I know it is a tough vote. I know the other side has good intentions, but this is the wrong bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank LOIS FRANKEL, CHERI BUSTOS, the chairman, and chairmen of our subcommittees, from DAVID CICILLINE to Chairman COHEN, for the work that they have done.

Let me agree with the gentleman from Kentucky in saying that it doesn't cost much. In fact, it doesn't cost much of anything as compared to the abuse that women have suffered for decades.

Let me also agree with the gentleman that there are and is something called States' rights under the Tenth Amendment, but let me be very clear that women don't have to suffer life-or-death circumstances under the Constitution.

I hold this book up for everybody to understand that this book does not require silence. This is not the Constitution of silence. This is not the Constitution of the 14th Amendment with equal protection of the law, yet as a woman you are silenced. It does not require due process, but you are silenced.

Let me give you a fact. More than half of all employed women report experiencing sexual harassment or sexual assault while at work. As a result, there is a significant concern that NDAs are, in fact, abusive, to the extent that it breaks a woman to not be able to tell of her harassment, abuse, or her rape.

Today, widespread sexual misconduct can be covered up by NDAs that are hiding the fine print that says, take it or leave it. When you have that, what you have is a circumstance where you are, in fact, promoting abuse and eliminating the power that women have and promoting the power that perpetrators have.

I would like to be able to stand on the Constitution that says to create a more perfect Union. This legislation does not allow the fine print, doesn't allow or make you sign an NDA before there is even an issue or a case that has arisen, and more importantly, I think it saves lives and future women from sexual assault and rape.

We know that Harvey Weinstein had this tool that was used over and over again. Employment contracts at his company included strict NDAs, which prevented survivors from coming forward with their stories.

I know that that is not the workplace that you want your daughters to go into, as our young women leave and begin to work from colleges, but also

the women who work as factory workers, secretaries, and waitresses.

Those used to be the jobs that people would look down on and say: Oh, we know why they are in those jobs. No, they were in those jobs so they could support their family, being a single parent, raising up their children. I know those women every day. Bus-drivers, schoolbus drivers getting minimum wage, but they encountered those conditions just as you would encounter them in the major corporations.

I am rising to support S. 4524, the Speak Out Act, and ask whether or not if you are a believer of the Constitution, where in it it says that you must be silenced, your due process is silenced, the 14th Amendment equal protection of the law is silenced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, all of this is silenced. The threat of legal retaliation is daunting to these women, enough to keep workers from coming forward with their stories of abuse. The Harvard Business Review has indicated over one-third of the U.S. workforce is bound by NDAs.

Madam Speaker, I close my remarks by saying, I walk away from here and saying that when we cast this vote, we will cast a vote for creating a more perfect Union, and that women will not be second class, second rate without the same equal protection of the law as anyone else.

I applaud the secretaries, the bus-drivers, the factory workers, the cafeteria workers who happen to be women, as well as I applaud the corporate women who are rising up the corporate ladder.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 4524, The Speak Out Act, that would limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment.

This bill is critical to ending the culture of silence that quiets the voices of survivors of sexual harassment and abuse.

We must protect women from harassment, abuse, and violence of all types, at every opportunity, and in every facet of life.

As chair of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I've led the fight against domestic violence for many years, and sponsored the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act, which led to VAWA's reauthorization in March.

Just as VAWA is vital to protect women in their personal lives, the Speak Out Act is vital to protect women in their work lives, empowering women against workplace harassment and abuse that can impair their careers and life paths.

Ending the cycle of abuse starts with eliminating the power that perpetrators have over their victims.

Currently, companies can sue workers for breaking a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

The threat of legal retaliation is daunting enough to keep workers from coming forward with stories of abuse.

These NDAs have become commonplace in many industries.

Harvard Business Review has estimated that over one third of the U.S. workforce is bound by NDAs.

These NDAs not only appear in settlements after a victim of sexual harassment has raised their voice, but also have become routinely included in standard employment contracts that are used at the time of hiring.

NDAs are being signed at the start of employment, prior to any abuse that occurs.

NDAs are intended to provide confidentiality and protection, especially with regard to corporate trade secrets.

But they have increasingly been misused to protect power dynamics that enable abusers to continue their dangerous and disgusting behavior.

One in 3 women has faced sexual harassment in the workplace during her career.

An estimated 87 to 94 percent of women who experience sexual harassment never file a formal complaint.

The reality is that many of these women have no voice because the system rewards male manipulators and penalizes women who challenge the status quo.

This amounts to institutionalized abuse.

The Speak Out Act can change this reality.

The Speak Out Act would prevent employers from enforcing nondisclosure or non-disparagement agreements (NDAs) in instances when employees and workers report sexual misconduct.

In the wake of the #MeToo and #TimesUp movements, our country has become acutely aware that men in power frequently leverage that power abusively to exploit women.

Sexual abuse and harassment can destroy a victim's financial security, mental health, and career path.

By standing up for their rights, the women who have been subjected to abuse often become mired in a lengthy and costly lawsuit that drains their finances, imposes a heavy psychic toll, and impairs their future job prospects by creating a misimpression that they are disruptive workers.

Women face a disturbing choice when sexually assaulted in the workplace: report the abuse publicly and face litigation, leave the company and abandon their income, or the choice that many are forced to make, put their heads down and pretend it did not happen.

Passing The Speak Out Act would provide victims with a third option to pursue justice.

It is time to amend the NDA system to strip the power from abusive employers and give it back to the employee.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), a valued member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the future chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio. I think whatever else voters said a week ago, they said, don't go too far. That is the reason the gentleman to my right will be the Judiciary Committee chairman and the gentleman far to my left will no longer be.

This goes too far. In the chairman's comments in support of the bill, he gave the pieces of information that

help us to detect why that is. One, he made reference to a bill, H.R. 4445, Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021, and he said, appropriately so, that that bill had bipartisan support, including mine. It made it so that women who suffer sexual harassment, anyone who suffers sexual harassment is no longer limited if they have entered into a contract forcing arbitration; for mandatory arbitration of a dispute of that nature, they can bring it to court. Court is public in the United States.

That bill was supported on a bipartisan basis because it is fair and equitable. The other thing the chairman said is that this bill, the one we are talking about now, will empower survivors of sexual harassment and sexual assault, but it also will empower non-survivors. That is to say, anyone who wishes to bring a nonmeritorious claim of sexual harassment forward in order to destroy someone's life also will be empowered by this to ignore any contract to do otherwise.

"A Rape on Campus" is a retracted defamatory Rolling Stone magazine article written by Sabrina Erdely and originally published on November 19, 2014, that describes a purported group sexual assault at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. Rolling Stone retracted the story in its entirety on April 5, 2015.

The article claimed that a UVA student, Jackie, had been taken to a party hosted by UVA's Phi Kappa Psi fraternity by a fellow student. At the party, Jackie alleged in the article, her date led her to a bedroom where she was gang-raped by several fraternity members as part of a fraternity initiation ritual.

Jackie's account generated much media attention, and UVA President Teresa Sullivan suspended all fraternities. After other journalists investigated the article's claims and found significant discrepancies, Rolling Stone issued multiple apologies for the story.

It has since been reported that Jackie may have invented portions of the story in an unsuccessful attempt to win the affections of a fellow student in whom she had a romantic interest. In a deposition given in 2016, Jackie stated that she believed her story at the time.

On January 12, 2015, Charlottesville police officials told UVA that an investigation had failed to find any evidence confirming the events in the Rolling Stone article. UVA President Teresa Sullivan acknowledged that the story was discredited.

Charlottesville police officially suspended their 4-month investigation on March 23, 2015, based on lack of credible evidence.

The Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism audited the editorial processes that culminated in the article being published. On April 5, 2015, Rolling Stone retracted the article and published the independent re-

port on the publication's history, and so forth.

Everyone remembers the Duke lacrosse incident in Durham, North Carolina. Everyone remembers the lives destroyed by these and other false allegations. They do happen.

The balance that we brought to the law by ensuring that every victim of sexual assault or harassment could come forward and sue, and if it is a suit against a public figure or against someone notorious or against someone rich or powerful, I have got to tell you, that will get publicity.

But it also is a system that has balance. People are subjected to discovery as to their motives. You have tools to find out and test the veracity of each side's views, each side's story.

This bill gives the green light to the false accuser. This bill says resume speed. It is a resume speed sign to those who would make false accusations. We brought balance to the law with the participation of Republicans and Democrats.

I grant you that that was a great bill. I congratulate you on bringing forward that bill, which I joined and voted for. This one is unfair and unbalanced. It goes too far.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, this bill goes so far; the gentleman from North Carolina tells us, this bill goes too far. It goes so far, in fact, that every Republican Member of the Senate voted for it. What a bunch of radicals.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, this bill is proof of the extraordinary leadership of Chairman NADLER and the Judiciary Committee. He has led our committee in a principled, determined way. I think as a result of his leadership, the Judiciary Committee has been the most productive, impactful, and effective committee in the Congress. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle look forward to a different chairman, I acknowledge the extraordinary leadership of our current chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 4524, the Speak Out Act. I applaud the sponsors, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. BUCK, and all the other bipartisan leaders who were part of this effort, including you, Madam Speaker.

This commonsense legislation will prevent the enforcement of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement agreements in sexual harassment and sexual assault disputes.

□ 1245

It will ensure that any survivor who wants to share their story without fear of judicially enforced reprisals can do so.

In fact, it is unthinkable, I hope to all of us, that widespread sexual misconduct can be covered up and swept under the rug because of NDAs snuck

into these take-it-or-leave-it contracts. It is well beyond time for this abusive practice to end.

Enacting the Speak Out Act will bring sunlight and transparency to a system that relies on the shadows to hide horrific conduct. It will make our society more just. It will help end the culture of silence that allows predators to evade accountability.

I look forward to sending this bill to the President's desk and taking another step in our critical and ongoing work to eliminate the forced silence that prevents survivors of sexual misconduct from having their voices heard.

Before closing, I want to address the argument raised by some of my Republican colleagues that the Speak Out Act interferes with the rights of States to establish their own laws on this issue. They are missing the point. This legislation protects an American value by prohibiting survivor censorship and defending the freedom of survivors to tell their own stories. This baseline freedom should not vary from State to State.

Finally, I want to say that the Speak Out Act creates a floor for the basic protection of survivors' rights to speak out, not a ceiling. States remain free to enact stronger protections for survivors. According to reports, 15 States have done just that, with some States like California banning the use of NDAs entirely. Federal legislation is still necessary because survivors should not have to rely on a patchwork of varying States, uncertain which might apply to them.

Finally, I end by noting that I am a little bit confused and, I will be honest, disappointed by the opposition I have heard from some of my Republican colleagues in light of their previous statements.

For example, during consideration of legislation that prohibited the enforcement of forced arbitration clauses in the same kinds of cases, Mr. JORDAN, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, said: "Victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault must have their claims heard. They must never be silenced or intimidated into silence."

The Speak Out Act provides precisely that protection. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation that was passed unanimously in the Senate that builds upon the great work of you, Madam Speaker, in H.R. 4445 so that, once and for all, we can no longer provide protection to predators and abusers that are acting with impunity in workplaces all over America.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, what a strange world the woke are creating. Their open borders policy has produced an epidemic of child sex trafficking. They use taxpayer dollars to transport unaccompanied minors

across the country. These children are then delivered to those claiming to be friends or family and then abandoned. The Biden administration has now lost track of 45,000 children that it has turned over to so-called sponsors in this manner.

Now, the Democrats won't even discuss the sex trafficking crisis that they have created, let alone do anything about it, because to condemn it is to acknowledge it, and they won't even do that. Yet, they bring a bill to the floor today to virtue signal their opposition to sexual harassment in the workplace. Specifically, it voids certain confidentiality clauses in cases involving sexual harassment.

Now, let's be clear, no civilized person condones such behavior, and several States have already passed laws similar to the measure before us today. That is where the Constitution rightly places such questions—with the States.

Federalism allows a State to try something out. If it works, other States copy it. If it doesn't, they can avoid it. This bill imposes the same standards across the country.

Now, what could possibly go wrong? Well, first, it references a study that includes among the definitions of sexual harassment a microaggression—I believe that is the word the woke use—such as misgendering.

The mere allegation of sexual harassment, without the necessity of any kind of proof, invalidates the nondisclosure agreement if the parties reach their agreement before the dispute arose. This bill doesn't define "dispute," so we don't even know when exactly it will apply.

If an employee accidentally refers to a colleague by a pronoun that has just changed, should this really be grounds for publicly pillorying the employer for sexual harassment? The woke excel at targeting those they disagree with in such a manner. This makes it possible for them to do so under a wide range of circumstances.

Second, if the mere allegation of sexual harassment can void a nondisclosure agreement, would someone simply throw in such an allegation in order to air their real grievances? Remember, this bill voids the confidentiality clause entirely, even though those clauses can cover information unrelated to sexual misconduct.

Third, where do such confidentiality carveouts stop? Are references in the workplace to political ideology, religious beliefs, or cultural preferences, already branded as microaggressions by the woke, to be added one by one?

We know this bill is just the beginning. The White House said as much this week.

Perhaps these are questions best left to the States. Perhaps our time is best devoted to protecting the countless children that the crime cartels are sexually exploiting with their active assistance of the Democrats' open border policies.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan, bicameral Speak Out Act. I thank Representative LOIS FRANKEL and the chairman for their leadership.

This bill bans forced nondisclosure agreements in assault and harassment disputes and preserves the right of survivors to use their voices.

Women across this country have been told for a long time what constitutes appropriate behavior, what constitutes sexual harassment, and what doesn't. Well, let me tell you, it is time to let them speak up and shine a light on exactly what is happening.

The reality is that estimates are that a third of employees in the United States are covered by these NDAs.

Last year, we heard stories of exactly this situation in the Judiciary Committee. Last year, Tatiana Spottiswoode bravely testified under the protection of a friendly subpoena about the harassment and abuse that she endured from her boss and former CEO, Zia Chishti. Previously, Tatiana had been bound by a gag order that silenced her and prevented accountability for her abuser.

Madam Speaker, after her moving testimony, after bringing light and being able to talk about the horror that she experienced, Chishti was finally fired. He was finally held accountable. In fact, the former British Prime Minister resigned from the company's advisory board after that happened.

Why should she have been silenced in the first place? Why should she have been raped or any other woman been raped and bound to silence because of a nondisclosure agreement that was forced, in many cases, in order for these women to be able to actually have employment? That is absolutely wrong.

Why should women be forced to feel alone, feel like somehow this is their fault, that they are crazy? They should be able to talk about what has happened and bring light to the situation.

The reality is, Madam Speaker, this is about power. This is about who holds the power and how it is held.

That is why we need the Speak Out Act to be passed. It is the only way to make sure that we bring transparency and light to this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, for millions of survivors across the country who deserve to have their voices heard, vote "yes" on S. 4524. I thank those people on the other side of the aisle who agree with us and know that this is the right thing to do.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill is very simple. It removes a muzzle from employees if they have been raped or harassed in the workplace.

By allowing women to expose predators in the workplace, this legislation further protects future victims. It also puts employers on notice that they must be more careful in performing due diligence and doing background checks on applicants.

Finally, this bill is limited to cases of rape and sexual harassment. This bill doesn't stop a worker from waiving their constitutional right to free speech in any other circumstance.

If you have trade secrets, you may be subjected to a nondisclosure agreement. If you object to the management practices of your employer, you may be subjected to a nondisclosure agreement. If you are raped, you may not be muzzled.

This legislation gives us a choice. We can protect rapists, predators, and perverts in the workplace, or we can give voice to victims, survivors, and the most vulnerable among us. We can assure Americans that our employers will only hire those employees who respect others in the workplace.

This bill received unanimous support in the Senate and has bipartisan support in the House. The reason is simple: We all had mothers who faced antiquated attitudes in the workplace. We don't want our daughters and our granddaughters to face those same attitudes.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this commonsense legislation. I very much appreciate the Speaker and Representative FRANKEL's leadership on this issue, and I hope that Republicans step up and do the right thing.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), a member of the committee.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, this is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is about stopping sexual predators.

For decades, Larry Nassar abused young girls on the U.S. women's national gymnastics team. At least 265 young women and girls—265 victims—were targeted and sexually abused by Nassar. It was all due to a nondisclosure statement that protected Nassar from justice.

Allowing sexual predators to hide behind nondisclosure agreements is wrong and is a crime.

Today, we have the power to stop sexual predators from hurting our loved ones.

I ask my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to vote for the Speak Out Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my great caucus cochair and good friend, Congresswoman LOIS

FRANKEL, for this bill. I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the Speaker for her extraordinary work in this area.

I sit here and think to myself: Are we living on two different planets? Why would any of you on the other side of the aisle want to prevent a woman or a man from speaking up if they were raped by someone in the office? Why would we allow for these NDAs?

Sexual harassment is an abuse of power made worse by the indignity of being silenced and gagged about your experience.

We have heard this morning that a third of the American workforce is bound by NDAs. Now, they were used originally to protect trade secrets. We appreciate that. We get that. But they have now been extended to be a weapon of choice for abusers and those orchestrating coverups.

Let's talk about the Washington Commanders' owner, Dan Snyder, at the NFL. Snyder assured his fans that he knew nothing about rampant and reprehensible harassment suffered by his employees, the women staffers forced to endure harassment and attempted assault. Some testified before the Committee on Oversight and Reform that they were told to avoid him at all costs and other predatory employees.

□ 1300

Snyder even had cheerleaders videotaped without their consent, and some without their knowledge, for a calendar photo shoot. The women posed topless using only their hands and arms or body paint to cover their breasts. Snyder knew they would have to change outfits and be exposed at times, and he made sure that he got the video to watch and share with his cronies.

Surprise: Snyder used prediscute NDAs with many of those women staffers.

Abusers like Snyder, Weinstein, Roger Ailes at FOX, and others should not be allowed to be the predators they are in the workforce. Women and men who become victims should be able to call them out.

It is time to end this predatory practice of silencing survivors. It is time for workers to have the freedom to speak out. For those who say that this should be a States' rights issue, remind me: Isn't it your party who wants to ban abortions across the country and not leave it to the States?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING).

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Speak Out Act.

One in three women in our country experiences sexual harassment in the

workplace at some point in her career. This appalling behavior is unacceptable, but it will not stop if survivors are silenced.

Let me be clear: any person who experiences sexual assault in the workplace or otherwise should be able to speak out and seek justice.

NDAs and nondisparagement clauses have been used for far too long to silence survivors of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace and instead shield abusers and the companies that enable them. The Speak Out Act helps to fix this flawed system and restores survivors' voices.

Contrary to some of the comments made by my colleagues across the aisle, this is a reasonable act that explicitly protects trade secrets and other proprietary information. It is carefully designed to remove the protection of predators. That is something we should all be in favor of.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to join me in supporting this critically important legislation so that those who wish to do so can hold perpetrators accountable and share their stories. This is something that should be important to all of us.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly support the Speak Out Act. It is carried by my dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk to you about why this is so important. Eight months ago, I stood in this Chamber to speak about my bill to expand the rights of sexual assault and sexual harassment survivors to seek justice.

I wrote a bill that is now law after reading the haunting stories of the thousands of women from a company called Sterling Incorporated, the parent company of Kay and Jared Jewelers. Each story was more disturbing than the one before it: managers demanding sexual acts in exchange for employment benefits and company events where women were expected to undress publicly. In one story, a former employee attended an overnight meeting where she woke up with her underwear pushed to her ankles and her manager raping her.

All of this stayed quiet, in secret for years all because of a few words that are hidden away in legal language filed alongside other forms and filled out as part of employment paperwork.

The women at Sterling Incorporated were silenced by forced arbitration clauses that prevented them from seeking justice in a court of law. But we know that these aren't the first nightmare stories that we have heard, and they won't be the last.

For way too long, the sinister culture of silence has protected predators and has shamed survivors. But as the saying goes, sunshine is the best disinfectant. The one way to dismantle this culture of silence is to let the voices and



the stories of the survivors be heard because those stories are powerful.

Survivors' stories launched the #MeToo movement. Survivors' stories inspired my bill to end forced arbitration and today's bill, and it will be those stories that will continue to bring change.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand on the right side of history and support the Speak Out Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, some have argued that the bill is not necessary because the courts may already choose not to enforce NDAs in certain cases. But this argument overlooks the reality that this scattershot approach to forced NDAs in sexual assault cases leaves survivors uncertain of their ability to tell their own stories without fear of reprisal, and it continues to allow NDAs to be used as an intimidation tactic by powerful corporations and abusers or as a coercive requirement for employment or everyday services.

Without a clear message from Congress that forced NDAs will no longer be enforceable in court, forced NDAs in employment and consumer contracts are likely to continue to have a chilling effect on survivors speaking out.

These contracts of silence limit the ability of millions of Americans to come forward in the first place. They contain sweeping prohibitions against any future negative statements about an employer. Standard language in these terms limit a survivor's ability to communicate by virtually any means, regardless of the truthfulness of the communication, in perpetuity.

In many cases, confidentiality clauses cover the existence of an NDA itself, meaning that even discussing the fact that one is bound by an NDA could constitute a violation of a contract.

There are cases in which survivors choose to waive their right to speak about their case. But that is a decision for survivors to make for themselves based on the circumstances, not something that should be forced upon them by their abusers or their enablers.

Last year, in a hearing that none of us will forget, the Judiciary Committee heard from four survivors of shocking workplace sexual harassment and assault. As they explained, after enduring horrific abuse at the hands of their perpetrators, confidential clauses in routine contracts prevented them from reporting and publicly disclosing their abuse.

The Speak Out Act ends this outrageous practice once and for all. Importantly, it does not prevent survivors from voluntarily entering into settlement agreements that include NDAs. Instead, it simply clarifies that these clauses cannot be enforced unless a

survivor chooses to agree to the clause after the dispute arises.

The Biden-Harris administration has issued a statement strongly supporting this legislation, noting that: "Prohibiting the use of predispute NDAs and nondisparagement clauses will increase access to justice and make the workplace safer for everyone."

The United States Senate has unanimously passed this legislation.

I have heard the argument from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we should leave this to the States and that the national legislation impinges on States' rights somehow. This is from the same people who urge a national ban on abortion.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to send this critical message to the President's desk, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 4524, the Speak Out Act. I am proud to support this bill and thank my good friends and colleagues Senator GILLIBRAND and Congresswoman FRANKEL for their leadership, and Chairman NADLER and the Speaker for bringing it to the floor.

This bill is a step toward ending a culture of silence and coercion that further deprives survivors of sexual assault from achieving justice.

We must put an end to the enablement of perpetrators in the workforce by eliminating the use of NDAs in sexual misconduct cases.

While this bill is progress toward eradicating institutional protections for perpetrators, we cannot stop here. As a champion of sexual and reproductive health and rights, I hope that we continue joining efforts to fix this toxic system and empower survivors of sexual assault to be the authors of their own stories.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1464, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 109, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—315

Adams	Beatty	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bera	F.
Allred	Beyer	Brown (MD)
Amodei	Bice (OK)	Brown (OH)
Armstrong	Biggs	Brownley
Arrington	Bilirakis	Buck
Auchincloss	Bishop (GA)	Bucshon
Axne	Blumenauer	Burchett
Bacon	Blunt Rochester	Burgess
Balderson	Bonamici	Bush
Barragán	Bourdeaux	Bustos
Bass	Bowman	Butterfield
		Calvert
		Cammack
		Carbajal
		Cárdenas
		Carey
		Carson
		Carter (LA)
		Cartwright
		Case
		Casten
		Castor (FL)
		Castro (TX)
		Chabot
		Cherfilus-
		McCormick
		Chu
		Ciциlline
		Clark (MA)
		Clarke (NY)
		Cleaver
		Clyburn
		Cohen
		Cole
		Comer
		Connolly
		Conway
		Cooper
		Correa
		Costa
		Courtney
		Craig
		Crawford
		Crenshaw
		Crow
		Cuellar
		Curtis
		Davids (KS)
		Davis, Danny K.
		Dean
		DeFazio
		DeGette
		DeLauro
		DelBene
		Demings
		DeSaulnier
		Diaz-Balart
		Dingell
		Doggett
		Ellzey
		Emmer
		Escobar
		Eshoo
		Espallat
		Evans
		Feenstra
		Fitzpatrick
		Fletcher
		Flood
		Flores
		Foster
		Frankel, Lois
		Gallagher
		Gallego
		Garamendi
		Garbarino
		Garcia (CA)
		Garcia (IL)
		Garcia (TX)
		Gimenez
		Golden
		Gomez
		Gonzales, Tony
		Gonzalez (OH)
		Gonzalez,
		Vicente
		Gooden (TX)
		Gottheimer
		Granger
		Graves (LA)
		Graves (MO)
		Green, Al (TX)
		Griffith
		Grijalva
		Guthrie
		Harder (CA)
		Hartzler
		Hayes
		Higgins (NY)
		Hill
		Himes
		Hinson
		Horsford
		Houlahan
		Hoyer
		Hudson
		Huffman
		Huizenga
		Issa
		Jackson Lee
		Jacobs (CA)
		Jacobs (NY)
		Jayapal
		Jeffries
		Johnson (GA)
		Johnson (OH)
		Johnson (TX)
		Jones
		Joyce (OH)
		Kahele
		Kaptur
		Katko
		Keating
		Keller
		Kelly (IL)
		Kelly (PA)
		Khanna
		Kildee
		Kilmer
		Kim (CA)
		Kim (NJ)
		Kind
		Kirkpatrick
		Krishnamoorthi
		Kuster
		Kustoff
		Lamb
		Langevin
		Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)
		Latta
		LaTurner
		Lawrence
		Lawson (FL)
		Lee (CA)
		Lee (NV)
		Leger Fernandez
		Letlow
		Levin (CA)
		Levin (MI)
		Lieu
		Lofgren
		Lowenthal
		Lucas
		Luetkemeyer
		Luria
		Lynch
		Mace
		Malinowski
		Malliotakis
		Maloney,
		Carolyn B.
		Maloney, Sean
		Manning
		Matsui
		McBath
		McCarthy
		McCaul
		McCollum
		McEachin
		McGovern
		McHenry
		McKinley
		McNerney
		Meeks
		Meijer
		Meng
		Meuser
		Mfume
		Miller-Meeks
		Moore (UT)
		Moore (WI)
		Morelle
		Moulton
		Mrvan
		Murphy (FL)
		Murphy (NC)
		Nadler
		Napolitano
		Neal
		Neguse
		Newhouse
		Newman
		Norcross
		O'Halleran
		Ocasio-Cortez
		Omar
		Owens
		Palazzo
		Pallone
		Panetta
		Pappas
		Pascarell
		Payne
		Peltola
		Perlmutter
		Peters
		Phillips
		Pingree
		Pocan
		Porter
		Posey
		Pressley
		Price (NC)
		Quigley
		Raskin
		Reschenthaler
		Rice (NY)
		Rice (SC)
		Rodgers (WA)
		Rogers (KY)
		Ross
		Rouzer
		Roybal-Allard
		Ruiz
		Ruppersberger
		Rush
		Ryan (NY)
		Salazar
		Sánchez
		Sarbanes
		Scalise
		Scanlon
		Schakowsky
		Schiff
		Schneider
		Schrader
		Schrier
		Schweikert
		Scott (VA)
		Scott, David
		Semolinski
		Sewell
		Sherman
		Sherrill
		Simpson
		Sires
		Slotkin
		Smith (MO)
		Smith (NE)
		Smith (NJ)
		Smith (WA)
		Smucker
		Soto
		Spanberger
		Spartz
		Speier
		Stansbury
		Stanton
		Steel
		Stefanik
		Stevens
		Stewart
		Strickland
		Suozzi
		Swalwell
		Takano
		Thompson (CA)
		Thompson (MS)
		Thompson (PA)
		Titus
		Tlaib
		Tonko
		Torres (CA)
		Torres (NY)
		Trahan
		Trone
		Underwood
		Upton
		Valadao
		Vargas
		Veasey
		Velázquez
		Wagner
		Waltz
		Wasserman
		Schultz
		Watson Coleman
		Wexton
		Wild
		Williams (GA)
		Wilson (FL)
		Wittman
		Womack
		Yarmuth

NAYS—109

Babin  
Baird  
Banks  
Barr

Bentz	Good (VA)	Mullin
Bergman	Gosar	Nehls
Bishop (NC)	Green (TN)	Norman
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Obernolte
Bost	Grothman	Palmer
Brady	Guest	Pence
Brooks	Harris	Perry
Buchanan	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Budd	Hern	Rogers (AL)
Carl	Herrell	Rose
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Rosendale
Carter (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Cawthorn	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Cline	Jackson	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Sessions
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Stauber
Davidson	Jordan	Steil
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Steube
Donalds	Kelly (MS)	Taylor
Duncan	LaHood	Tenney
Dunn	LaMalfa	Tiffany
Estes	Lamborn	Timmons
Fallon	Lesko	Turner
Ferguson	Long	Van Drew
Finstad	Loudermilk	Van Dyne
Fischbach	Mann	Walberg
Fitzgerald	Massie	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Mast	Webster (FL)
Foxx	McClain	Wenstrup
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Westerman
Scott	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)
Fulcher	Miller (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Yakym
Gibbs	Mooney	Zeldin
Gohmert	Moore (AL)	

## NOT VOTING—8

Cheney	Herrera Beutler	Welch
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger	
Doyle, Michael	Ryan (OH)	
F.	Waters	

□ 1349

Messrs. ARMSTRONG, LATTA, and GOODEN of Texas changed their votes from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, due to a conflict, I was not present to cast my vote on passage of S. 4524 The Speak Out Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 480.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Cicilline)	Johnson (TX)	Palazzo
Brooks (Moore)	(Stevens)	(Bilirakis)
(AL)	Kirkpatrick	Payne (Pallone)
Cawthorn (Gaetz)	(Pallone)	Porter (Neguse)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Pressley (Bush)
(Perlmutter)	(Wasserman	Rice (SC)
Demings (Kelly	Schultz)	(Valadao)
(IL)	Long	Sherrill
Gallego	(Fleischmann)	(Pallone)
(Stanton)	McEachin	Soto (Wasserman
Gonzalez,	(Trone)	Schultz)
Vicente	Morelle (Meng)	Thompson (CA)
(Correa)	Murphy (FL)	(Correa)
Green (TN)	(Wasserman	Waltz (Valadao)
(Fleischmann)	Schultz)	Wild (Cicilline)
Himes	Newman (Correa)	Wilson (FL)
(Perlmutter)	O'Halleran	(Cicilline)
Jacobs (NY)	(Pappas)	
(Sempolinski)		

## PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 4130

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 4130, a bill originally introduced by Representative TED DEUTCH of Florida, for the purpose of adding co-sponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP WEEK

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Apprenticeship Week and to highlight the importance of registered apprenticeships in building a diverse and talented workforce, expanding economic opportunity, and growing a more inclusive and resilient economy.

Registered apprenticeships allow workers to learn and earn both a living wage and a nationally recognized credential within their industry of choice.

Workers who go through apprenticeships earn an average starting salary of \$70,000 a year, a salary that provides them with social mobility and economic security.

This Congress, we have passed historic legislation to fix our roads, bridges, ports, and infrastructure; to shore up domestic semiconductor manufacturing; and to combat climate change. The laws we pass create a need for thousands of well-prepared and fairly compensated workers.

Mr. Speaker, during this year's National Apprenticeship Week, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in expanding the opportunity to get more people, including more women and people of color, on the path to a good job by investing in registered apprenticeships.

## HONORING LAURA WOOTEN

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate one of the unsung civic heroes of our time.

Last month, I attended a dedication ceremony of Laura Wooten Hall at Princeton University. Wooten Hall houses Princeton's Center for Human Values, and it is only fitting that it was named for a woman who devoted her life to something greater than herself.

For nearly 80 years, Laura Wooten served as a poll worker, ensuring that the people of New Jersey could exercise their sacred right to vote. Her service earned her the honor of being the longest continuously serving poll worker in United States history.

Despite living from the Jim Crow era through present-day attacks on voting rights, Laura Wooten's dedication to our democracy never wavered. May her life of selfless civil service be an inspiration to all of us.

□ 1400

## PROTECTING THE DREAMERS

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize how critical it is for the Senate to protect the DACA program and the more than 800,000 Dreamers in America.

Brought here as children through no fault of their own, Dreamers have gone to our schools, grown up in our neighborhoods, served on the front lines for the pandemic, and are just as American as all of us in this room. Yet, the DACA program hangs by a thread because of right-wing politicians and judges.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of Americans already support Dreamers obtaining a path to legal citizenship. So I call on the Senate to act. America wants action. We must pass legislation this Congress, or our Dreamers will suffer. We must put people over politics, Dreamers over rhetoric. It is now or never for America's Dreamers. We must act.

## HONORING REVEREND DR. CALVIN O. BUTTS III

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and legacy of the legendary Reverend Dr. Calvin O. Butts III. As the pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church for 50 years, Reverend Butts understood his role as a leader went beyond the faith community.

Witnessing the racial strife of the late 1960s, Reverend Butts became an ardent protector of Harlem, particularly the Black community, and often pushed for projects and policies that would increase access to dire needs like housing and education.

Reverend Butts led projects that included raising and investing \$1 billion in housing and commercial development in Harlem through the Abyssinian Development Corporation and creating the Thurgood Marshall Academy for Learning and Social Change.

Reverend Butts preached a message of faith and education, and he motivated each of us through his teachings to be an active and exemplary member of Harlem, uplifting communities while giving back through service, engagement, and social reform.

A dear friend and icon of Harlem, may he rest in peace, and may his legacy be cherished and never forgotten. Keep the faith.

## CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN SLAVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, as my friends are assisting me, I